



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/664,882	09/22/2003	Kazutoshi Aida	60188-661	4245
7590	01/24/2006		EXAMINER	
Jack Q. Lever, Jr. McDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY 600 Thirteenth Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20005-3096			ABRAHAM, ESAW T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2133	

DATE MAILED: 01/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/664,882	AIDA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Esaw T. Abraham	2133	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 September 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 22 September 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/22/03</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-8 are presented for examination.

Priority

2. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). (Foreign application Japan 2002-275597)

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The references listed in the information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 12/22/03 have been considered by the examiner (see attached PTO-1449).

Specification

4. The **title** of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere CO.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
5. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marukawa (U.S. PN: 6,836511).

As per claim 1:

Marukawa teach a digital reproduced signal processing apparatus for reading out a signal from a recording medium of a digital recording apparatus comprising: an analog/digital converter for converting the analog reproduced signal; an FIR filter for filtering the digital reproduced signal with the use of an adaptive equalization coefficient; an adaptive equalization coefficient setting device (a target holding means) for equalizing the impulse response of the digital reproduced signal with the impulse characteristic of a partial response defined by (a, b, b, a) and determining the adaptive equalization coefficient to release the digital reproduced signal filtered by the FIR filter as an equalized digital reproduced signal; a phase comparator for detecting a phase error signal from the digital reproduced signal or the equalized digital reproduced signal; a partial response temporal judgment device responsive to the output signal of the FIR filter for producing and feeding a temporal data judgment signal to the adaptive equalization coefficient setting device and the phase comparator and a Viterbi decoder

for decoding the equalized digital reproduced signal released from the FIR filter to a data for judgment (See col. 4, lines 46-67). Marukawa **does not explicitly teach** a target holding means (LMA [equalization target]) for holding a value signals. **However**, Marukawa teaches that adaptive equalization coefficient setting device (6) requires a temporal judgment level which is used to calculate the adaptive equalization coefficient with the use of an algorithm of least means square (referred to as LMS hereinafter) and the LMS provides a feedback function for minimizing the square error between desired response and transmission line response which Marukawa is basically teaching the functionality of the target holding means (referred in the applicants specification as equalization targets with in the LMS block). Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ a holding means or LMS blocks for holding target values as taught by Marukawa. **This modification** would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art in order to enhance reading performance of signal processing which is significantly reduced in the circuit arrangement (see col. 6, lines 30-35).

As per claim 2:

Marukawa teach all the subject matter claimed in claim 1 including Marukawa teach an FIR filter for filtering the digital reproduced signal with the use of an adaptive equalization coefficient (see col. 4, lines 55-60).

As per claims 3 and 4:

Marukawa teach all the subject matter claimed in claims 1 and 2 including Marukawa teach an adaptive equalization coefficient setting device (a target holding

means) for equalizing the impulse response of the digital reproduced signal with the impulse characteristic of a partial response defined by (a, b, b, a) and determining the adaptive equalization coefficient to release the digital reproduced signal filtered by the FIR filter as an equalized digital reproduced signal. Marukawa further teach a partial response temporal judgment device responsive to the output signal of the FIR filter for producing and feeding a temporal data judgment signal to the adaptive equalization coefficient setting device and feeding a temporal data judgment signal to the adaptive equalization coefficient setting device and the phase comparator (see col. 4, lines 57-67).

As per claims 5-8:

Marukawa teach all the subject matter claimed in claims 1 and 2 including Marukawa teach an adaptive equalization coefficient setting device (a target holding means) for equalizing the impulse response of the digital reproduced signal with the impulse characteristic of a partial response defined by (a, b, b, a) and determining the adaptive equalization coefficient to release the digital reproduced signal filtered by the FIR filter as an equalized digital reproduced signal. Marukawa further teach a partial response temporal judgment device responsive to the output signal of the FIR filter for producing and feeding a temporal data judgment signal to the adaptive equalization coefficient setting device and feeding a temporal data judgment signal to the adaptive equalization coefficient setting device and the phase comparator. Furthermore, the phase comparator detects a phase error signal from the digital reproduced signal or the equalized digital reproduced signal (see col. 4, lines 57-67).

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US PN: 6,819,514 Behrens et al.

US PN: 6,563,889 Shih et al.

US PN: 6,476,992 Shimataki

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Esaw Abraham whose telephone number is (571) 272-3812. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are successful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert DeCady can be reached on (571) 272-3819. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (571) 273-8300 for regular communications and (571) 273-8300 for after final communications.

Information regarding the status of an Application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or PUBLIC PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private Pair only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/664,882

Page 7

Art Unit: 2133

Esaw Abraham

Cynthia Barth

Esaw Abraham

Art unit: 2133